REMARKS

As a result of the above amendments, Claims 42-63 remain pending. Claims 64-83 have been added. No new matter has been added. Thus, Claims 42-83 are now pending.

Claim 64 has been added, and is directed to a method of receiving messaging information at a wireless device. A messaging signal is received at the device, and in response to that, an advertisement is immediately displayed at the device. For a predetermined period of time, the advertisement is displayed, and the messaging information is not displayed. After that predetermined period of time, the messaging information is displayed. A user selection to view messaging information, i.e. the second viewing of the messaging information, is detected. In response to that detection, a preference is detected to display advertisements. In response to that detection, either: (a) the advertisement is displayed at the device for the predetermined period of time, after which the messaging information is displayed, or (b) the messaging is displayed at the device, but the advertisement is not displayed. Claims 65-69 have been added, and are dependent on Claim 64. None of the known references, either separately or in combination, disclose each and every element of Claim 64.

Claim 70 has been added, and is also directed to a method of receiving messaging information at a wireless device. The device is programmed with a set of advertisements and a set of periods of time, such that each of the advertisements is uniquely associated with one of the periods of time. Messaging information is received at the wireless device, and one of the advertisements is displayed for the period of time uniquely associated with it. During that time, the messaging information is not displayed. After that period of time has expired, the messaging information is displayed. Claims 71-76 have been added, and are dependent on Claim 70. None of the known references, either separately or in combination, disclose each and every element of Claim 70.

Claim 77 has been added, and is also directed to a method of receiving messaging information at a wireless device. The wireless device is programmed with a set of advertisements, each of which is associated with a percentage of time positions. Messaging information is received at the wireless device, and in response to that receipt, one of the time periods is randomly selected. The advertisement associated with that selected time period is

displayed for that selected time period. During that time, the messaging information is not displayed. After that period of time has expired, the messaging information is displayed. Claims 78-83 have been added, and are dependent on Claim 77. None of the known references, either separately or in combination, disclose each and every element of Claim 77.

Remarks Concerning Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

U.S. Patent No. 6,031,467 to Hymel et al. ("Hymel")

On page 2 of the August 12, 2004 Office Action ("Office Action"), the Examiner rejected Claims 54, 55 and 60 as being anticipated by Hymel. However, Hymel does not teach at least the last clause of Claim 54, which is directed to *not* displaying the advertising information after that information has already been displayed at least once. Furthermore, Applicants draw the Examiner's attention to the fact that the Examiner, in restating the claim elements of Claim 54, did not include that claim element among the recited elements. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 54 is directed to a method for receiving paging information at a wireless device. The paging information is received, and then an advertisement is displayed for a predetermined period of time. During that time, the paging information is not displayed. After waiting the predetermined period of time, the paging information is displayed. Claim 54 provides additional functionality: after viewing the paging information at least one time, the user can then select to see the paging information a *second* time. During this *second* viewing, the advertising information is *not* displayed. Hymel does not make such a disclosure. In fact, Hymel is silent entirely on the second viewing of a received paging information. Applicants respectfully submit that the last clause of Claim 54 therefore distinguishes this claim over Hymel, and is in condition for allowance.

Claim 60 includes a similar limitation, allowing the user to view the paging information a second time, without viewing the advertising information. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 60 is likewise distinguished over Hymel and in condition for allowance.

The Examiner also rejected Claim 55 as being anticipated by the same Hymel reference. Claim 55 is dependent on Claim 54, and Applicants submit that because Claim 54 is in condition for allowance, therefore dependent Claim 55 is as well.

U.S. Patent No. 6,674,357 to Bermel ("Bermel")

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 48 as being anticipated by Bermel. However, Bermel does not teach the step of uniquely associating advertisements with predetermined lengths of time, as provided for in the present invention. Claim 48 has been amended. In light of the amendment made herein to Claim 48, Applicants submit that it is now in condition for allowance.

Claim 48 is directed to a method for receiving paging information. A first paging information is received, and an advertisement is displayed for a first predetermined period of time. A second paging information is then received, and an advertisement is displayed for a second predetermined period of time. Bermel discloses that advertisements may be displayed for varying periods of time, e.g. col. 5, ll. 48-55. However, Bermel does not disclose associating each of the advertisements with a *unique* predetermined period of time. According to Bermel, different types of advertisements have a predetermined period of display time associating with that *type* of advertisement. For example, Bermel discloses that news advertisements are displayed for 30 seconds, while other advertisements are displayed for 15 seconds. See Bermel, col. 5, ll. 45-55. Bermel does not disclose that *each* advertisement has a unique predetermined period of time associated with it; rather, each *type* of advertisement is associated with a predetermined period of time. Claim 48 is hereby amended to clarify that in the present invention, each unique advertisement is associated with a unique predetermined period of display time. Because Bermel does not disclose that feature, Applicants submit that Claim 48, as amended, therefore distinguishes over Bermel and is in condition for allowance.

Remarks Concerning Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Hymel in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,429,812 to Hoffberg ("Hoffberg")

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 42 and 43 as being unpatentable over Hymel in view of Hoffberg. As the Examiner noted, Hymel is silent on teaching the step of immediately displaying the advertisement at the wireless device in response to receiving the page signal. The Examiner stated that Hoffberg teaches this step. However, neither Hymel nor Hoffberg teaches the step of detecting a preference to display the advertisement on the second viewing of the paging information. Claim 42, as amended, includes

this step. Therefore, Applicants submit that in light of the amendment made herein to Claim 42, the claim is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner also rejected Claim 43, which is dependent on Claim 42. In light of the amendment made herein to Claim 42, Applicants submit that both claims are now in condition for allowance.

Hymel and Hoffberg in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,814 to Hymel et al. ("Hymel II")

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 44 and 57 as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of Hymel, Hoffberg, and Hymel II. With respect to Claim 44, Applicants submit that none of the cited references teach the step of detecting a preference to display the advertisement upon the second viewing of the paging information. This limitation has been added to Claim 42, on which Claim 44 depends. Therefore, in light of the amendment made herein to Claim 42, Applicants submit that Claim 44 is now in condition for allowance.

With respect to Claim 57, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection for the same reason. Claim 57 is dependent on Claim 54. The penultimate clause of Claim 54 provides for displaying the paging information *without* displaying the advertisement on the *second* viewing of the paging information. None of the cited references disclose this step. Claim 54, and its dependent Claim 57, are therefore patentable over the cited references, and Applicants submit that they are in condition for allowance.

Hymel and Hoffberg in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,477,365 to Fukuda ("Fukuda")

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 45 as being unpatentable over Hymel, Hoffberg, and Fukuda. The Examiner noted that Hymel and Hoffberg do not teach the step of displaying a company name in an advertisement. Claim 45 is dependent on Claim 42, which has been amended to clarify that upon a second viewing of the paging information, a preference is detected to either display an advertisement or not. None of the cited references disclose this step. Therefore, in light of the amendment made herein to Claim 42, Applicants submit that dependent Claim 45 is patentable over these references and is in condition for allowance.

Hymel and Hoffberg in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,434,383 to Bruno ("Bruno")

On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 46, 47, 58 and 59 as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of Hymel, Hoffberg and Bruno. The Examiner noted that neither Hymel nor Hoffberg teaches that the paging information includes a person's phone number or name. However, none of the cited references teach the step of detecting a preference to display an advertisement on the second viewing of the paging information. That limitation has been added to Claim 42 by way of the amendment made herein. Claims 46 and 47 depend on Claim 42. Therefore, Applicants submit that Claims 46 and 47 are patentably distinct over these references, and are in condition for allowance.

With respect to Claims 58 and 59, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 58 and 59 depend on Claim 54. The last clause of Claim 54 includes the step of displaying the paging information a second time, during which the paging is displayed and the advertisement is *not* displayed. None of the cited references disclose this limitation. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 54 is therefore patentably distinct, and its dependent Claims 58 and 59 are also therefore patentably distinct for the same reasons.

Bermel in view of Hymel II

On pages 7 and 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 49 and 50 as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of Bermel and Hymel II. The Examiner noted that Bermel does not teach the step of preprogramming the wireless device with an advertisement. Claims 49 and 50 depend on Claim 48. In light of the amendment made herein to Claim 48, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As noted previously, Claim 48 is hereby amended to clarify that each of the advertisements programmed in the wireless device is uniquely associated with a predetermined period of time for its display. None of the cited references disclose this limitation. Therefore, Claim 48 is patentably distinct over the cited references, and its dependent Claims 49 and 50 are therefore patentably distinct for the same reasons.

Bermel in view of Fukuda

On page 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 51 as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of Bermel and Fukuda. Claim 51 is dependent on Claim 48, which, as noted previously, is patentably distinct as amended over all of the cited references. Therefore,

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that because Claim 48 is in condition for allowance, so too is its dependent Claim 51.

Bermel in view of Bruno

On page 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 52 and 53 as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of Bermel and Bruno. Both Claims 52 and 53 are dependent on Claim 48, which, as noted previously, is patentably distinct as amended over all of the cited references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that because Claim 48 is in condition for allowance, so too are its dependent Claims 52 and 53.

Hymel in view of Hymel II

On page 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 57 as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of Hymel and Hymel II. Claim 57 is dependent on Claim 54. None of the cited references teach the step of displaying the paging information upon the second viewing of the paging information *without* displaying the advertisement. Claim 54 includes this limitation, and therefore is patentably distinct over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that because Claim 54 is in condition for allowance, so too is its dependent Claim 57.

Hymel in view of Bruno

On page 11 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 58 and 59 as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of Hymel and Bruno. Claims 58 and 59 are both dependent on Claim 54. Neither Hymel nor Bruno teach the step of displaying the paging information upon the second viewing of the paging information without displaying the advertisement. Claim 54 includes this limitation, and is therefore patentably distinct over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that because Claim 54 is in condition for allowance, so too are its dependent Claims 58 and 59.

Hymel in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,008,819 to Robson et al. ("Robson")

On page 11 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 61 as unpatentable over the combined teachings of Hymel and Robson. Claim 61 is dependent on Claim 60. Neither Hymel nor Robson teach the step of displaying the paging information upon the second viewing of the paging information without displaying the advertisement. Claim 60 includes this limitation, and is therefore patentably distinct over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants

respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that because Claim 60 is in condition for allowance, so too is its dependent Claim 61.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 12, 2004 By: _____

James P. Muraff, Reg. No. 39,785
Wallenstein Wagner & Rockey, Ltd.
311 South Wacker Drive, 53rd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6630
312.554.3300

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 C.F.R. § 1.8a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being deposited with the United States Postal Service, with first class postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on November 12, 2004

_____
Gillian Gardner
(211401v1)